

01
02
03
04
05
06 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
07 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

08 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) CASE NO. CR00-599 RSL
09 Plaintiff,)
10 v.) SUMMARY REPORT OF U.S.
11 BRADLEY PAUL DUNKLING,) MAGISTRATE JUDGE AS TO
12 Defendant.) ALLEGED VIOLATIONS
OF SUPERVISED RELEASE
13

14 An initial hearing on supervised release revocation in this case was scheduled before me
15 on October 29, 2009. The United States was represented by AUSA Adam Cornell and the
16 defendant by Michele Shaw. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

17 Defendant had been sentenced on or about July 20, 2001 by the Honorable Robert S.
18 Lasnik on a charge of Conspiracy to Distribute Marijuana and sentenced to 87 months custody,
19 3 years supervised release. (Dkt. 59.)

20 The conditions of supervised release included the standard conditions plus the
21 requirements that defendant submit to mandatory drug testing, participate in a drug treatment
22 program, abstain from alcohol, pay restitution in the amount of \$10,000, provide his probation

01 officer with access to financial information, be prohibited from incurring new credit obligations
02 or lines of credit, not be self-employed or employed by friends, relatives or other persons
03 previously known to defendant unless approved by his probation officer, obtain approval for all
04 employment and provide verification, and not work for cash.

05 The conditions of supervised release were modified on March 1, 2006 to require
06 defendant to maintain a single checking account for all financial transactions, to divulge all
07 business interests to his probation officer, and to be prohibited from gambling or being involved
08 in any gambling establishments or activity unless approved. (Dkt. 84.) On September 19, 2007,
09 defendant admitted violating the conditions of supervised release by engaging in gambling and
10 being involved in a gambling establishment without approval. (Dkt. 92.) Defendant was
11 sentenced to five months in custody (the last 30 days being in a community confinement center),
12 28 months supervised release. (Dkt. 96.)

13 On February 4, 2008, defendant's supervised release was modified to require participation
14 in a home confinement program with electronic monitoring for 30 days, in lieu of the community
15 confinement center. (Dkt. 99.)

16 In an application dated September 28, 2009 (Dkt. 100), U.S. Probation Officer Brian K.
17 Facklam alleged the following violations of the conditions of supervised release:

18 1. Associating with James "Jamie" Barrett, a convicted felon, in violation of standard
19 condition 9.

20 2. Associating with others engaged in criminal activity, in violation of standard
21 condition 9.

22 3. Failing to disclose all assets to the probation officer in violation of his special

01 conditions of supervision.

02 4. Incurring new credit charges without approval of the probation officer in violation
03 of his special conditions of supervision.

04 Defendant was advised in full as to those charges and as to his constitutional rights.

05 Defendant admitted the alleged violations and waived any evidentiary hearing as to
06 whether they occurred.

07 I therefore recommend the Court find defendant violated his supervised release as
08 alleged, and that the Court conduct a hearing limited to the issue of disposition. The next
09 hearing will be set before Judge Lasnik.

10 Pending a final determination by the Court, defendant has been released on the conditions
11 of supervision.

12 DATED this 29th day of October, 2009.

13 

14 Mary Alice Theiler
15 United States Magistrate Judge

16
17 cc: District Judge: Honorable Robert S. Lasnik
18 AUSA: Adam Cornell
19 Defendant's attorney: Michele Shaw
20 Probation officer: Brian K. Facklam
21
22